20c SEPTEMBER 1, 1952

WHO IS RICHARD NIXON?—page 9

New Republic

The Charles C. Sherrod Library
EAST TENNESSEE STATE COLLEGE
Johnson City, Tennessee

AUG 27 1952

EISENHOWER AND JENNER

Can Ike Support the Man Who Made . . .

"The most venomous, the most diabolical, the most reprehensible, the most unfortunate and irresponsible speech I have ever heard on the floor of the Senate or of the House of Representatives."

— Senator Karl Mundt

How Will Eisenhower Decide on Sept. 9?

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Letters

Professional Discrimination

● I am writing you because of my indignation at a glaring case of racial and professional discrimination which I have observed here in Marin County, California.

The situation centers about Dr. Rudolf Wolff, a German immigrant physician of Jewish extraction, who has been practicing in Mill Valley for 14 years. I am well acquainted with him, as he has treated my wife and myself on numbers of occasions; we have found him warm, human, humane, friendly, courteous, prompt, sensible and entirely competent and efficient on every matter regarding which we have consulted him. And this is the consensus among his many patients whom we have known. His medical fees, incidentally, have been unusually low; and we have known patients for whom he has gone out of his way to provide all sorts of kindly (and unpaid) attentions outside of the line of regular duty.

The case involving him arose only recently. The Marin General Hospital, a badly needed county institution built at public expense, was opened in May; and Dr. Wolff, like other physicians, applied for courtesy permission to treat his patients there. In every other known case of a full-fledged practitioner, the application was granted; in Dr. Wolff's case, it was denied. As the only legitimate reasons for denial are malpractice and incompetence, this instantly threw cloud over Dr. Wolff's reputation—a cloud all the harder to dissipate since there were no specific charges, and nothing but misty generalities to combat. Wolff engaged an attorney, and demanded an open hearing of the alleged charges. Such an open hearing is guaranteed by state law; section 32106 of the health and safety code provides that, in the case of district hospitals, "all of the sessions of the board of directors, whether regular or special, shall be open to the public." Yet Dr. Wolff, after being assured of his right to a public hearing, was notified that he would not have one.

Not only did the directors fly in the face of state law; they reversed their own bylaws for the purposes of this specific case: their original rules provided that any hearing should be "open to the public unless the applicant requests that said hearing be closed." But though they revised the bylaws so as to debar Dr. Wolff from the light of day, they almost immediately afterward granted the requests of two osteopathic physicians (one of them a San Rafael city councilor) for a public hearing.

They put off the closed meeting for two months, during which Dr. Wolff must labor beneath a libelous burden of imputations; they prescribed that neither he nor his attorney should be notified of the nature of the charges until the time of the meeting (giving him no opportunity to prepare an answer); they refused to mention the names of the supposed witnesses; they denied his own witnesses the right to hear any evidence at the sessions except their own; and they scoffed at Dr. Wolff's reiterated statement that if there was anything to be said, it should be said in the open.

More recently, the pressure of public opinion has been achieving some results. Following the condemnation by the Marin Central Labor Council of the plans for a closed meeting, the directors reversed themselves to the extent of permitting an open hearing. However, at the time this is being written, Dr. Wolff is still desperately seeking to learn the nature of the asserted charges and the names of his accusers. "Why did they single me out?" he continues to ask. Meanwhile a citizens' group calling itself the Wolff Case Committee has organized in the physician's defense; while coincidentally Henry X. Jackson, administrator of the new hospital, has announced his resignation, which, it is insisted, is in no way connected with Dr. Wolff.

I should add that not one medical voice in the county has been publicly lifted for Dr. Wolff, though the local papers are full of letters on his behalf from patients and non-patients alike, and 33 letters favoring him were reported to have been received sometime ago by the directors of the hospital. Despite all the efforts for Dr. Wolff, however, I think that here is an insidious case of character assassination—built on prejudice arising not only from Wolff's religion but from his lower professional fees and the fact that he has antagonized other physicians by his connection with the much-needed Permanent Health Insurance Plan.

Mill Valley, Calif. STANTON COBLENTZ

Killing Capitalism with Kindness

● One of our top-notch economists, J. A. Schumpeter, sees capitalism on the way out because of excesses and exploitations. "It is being killed by its achievements." Which is not as surprising as it seems at first glance in view of a lack of moral balance and of a skilled technical administration, and victimization of the system by pressure groups. On this point columnist Kent comments: "The almost incredible incompetency with which our system operates makes it ridiculous for us to urge its adoption upon other nations."

When we get nicely set for the eventuality foreshadowed by Schumpeter along comes J. K. Galbraith—"American Capitalism"—seeing a perfection few other economists recognize: "Since the efficiency of the economic system is already at a maximum without government interference, it must be presumed that any intervention of government would reduce efficiency." Where has he been during the creation of RCA, AAA, MSA, and other business boosting and control agencies?

On this presumption of system efficiency Galbraith offers us the "countervailing power" of the Big Four—labor unions, farmers, business and government—which supposedly insures balance for the system, and a "new model" of competition which does away with the necessity for anti-trust laws and such.

In the final analysis the new model merely represents a new competition phase, and old faults manifesting in a

(Continued on page 4)

Bandwagon

Never Underestimate . . .

Peter Pan Foundations, Inc., will build its entire fall advertising campaign for Peter Pan brassieres around the coming Presidential election. . . . The number of stores listed from each state will equal the state's number of electoral votes. (Newspaper) ads will have this theme: "The ballot box needs the women's touch. Don't forget to vote."—*From* Tide *Newsletter.*

Don't Take It Away!

What is frightfully upsetting to the Republicans . . . is that one-fifth of all shareholders [1,300,000] bought stocks since the election of "that man" to the White House in 1948. . . . The Brookings survey doesn't say anything about it, but it is reasonable to presume that about two-thirds of the investors made their investments since "that other man" was elected in 1932.—*From the Madison Capital* Times.

Taft and McCarthy, Too?

. . . Nixon said the Republican campaign will be directed against "Trumanism" . . . Stevenson as an individual and his personal history "are not an issue and should not be an issue," he declared.—*From the St. Louis* Post Dispatch.

Our readers are invited to contribute; $2 will be paid for each item used. Address Bandwagon, c/o New Republic. Please enclose the original clipping. – The Editors.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

New Republic

CONTENTS FOR SEPT. 1, 1952

5 "Venomous . . . Diabolical . . . Irresponsible" An Editorial
7 The Week:
7 The Campaign
7 Kurt Schumacher
7 Secret Oil
7 Steel and Living Costs
8 The Vatican and the Kremlin
9 Who is Richard Nixon? by Ernest Brashear
13 Time and Taft-Hartley, by Joseph E. Finley
15 Stubborn Facts and Stubborn Ideals, by Woodrow Wyatt
18 Literature and the Arts:
18 Fraenger, *The Millenium of Heironymous Bosch*, by Herbert Read
19 In Asia and Elsewhere, by L. Griswold
19 Chaucer, *The Canterbury Tales*, by William Becker
20 N. Demuth, *Musical Trends of the 20th Century*, by R. Evett
21 F. Calkins, *The CIO and the Democratic Party*, by H. F. C.
21 Lord Radcliffe, *The Problem of Power*, by G. W. Johnson
21 L. Kanner, *In Defense of Mothers*, by H. Illing
22 R. L. Taylor, *Winston Churchill*, by S. Cooperman
22 A Theatre Miscellany

EDITOR: Michael Straight
CHAIRMAN, Editorial Board: Bruce Bliven
PUBLISHER: Daniel Mebane
MANAGING EDITOR: Helen Fuller
LITERARY EDITOR: Robert Richman
REPORTERS: Jean Begeman, Arnold J. Heidenheimer
CONTRIBUTING EDITORS: Eric Bentley, Malcolm Cowley, Robert Evett
CONTRIBUTING CRITICS: W. H. Auden, Nicola Chiaramonte, Harold Clurman, Dudley Fitts, Kimon Friar, Gerald Johnson, V. O. Key, Max Lerner, Richard Lester, James R. Newman, Kathleen Raine, John Crowe Ransom, Herbert Read, Mark Schorer, James Johnson Sweeney, Robert Penn Warren
ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: F. R. Ruskin
COPY ASSISTANT: Lucille Davis

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1952 IN THE USA BY WESTBURY PUBLICATIONS, INC., PUBLISHING OFFICE 301 N ST., N.E., WASHINGTON 2, D. C. EDITORIAL COMMUNICATIONS SHOULD BE ADDRESSED TO 1416 F ST, N.W., WASHINGTON 4, D. C. BUSINESS COMMUNICATIONS SHOULD BE ADDRESSED TO 40 EAST 49TH ST., NEW YORK 17, N. Y. ENTERED AS SECOND-CLASS MATTER SEPTEMBER 26, 1950, AT THE POST OFFICE AT WASHINGTON, D. C., UNDER THE ACT OF MARCH 3, 1879. SINGLE COPY, 20c; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, $6.50; CANADA AND FOREIGN, $7.50. PRINTED IN THE USA.

WASHINGTON WIRE

THE DEMOCRATS are like the man in the apartment below waiting for the first shoe to drop. It is not a matter of waiting for the second shoe, because up to this writing the big guns of the GOP have said nothing that hasn't been said a thousand times in the last 12 years. It is difficult to believe that the kind of campaign General Eisenhower has conducted to date is the kind he will conduct in September and October. If he continues to deal only in generalities and to support the Old Guard, then it should be a walkaway for Governor Stevenson.

Nevertheless, there are a number of people here who believe that the Democrats are overconfident. If they are, then it is a dangerous disease. Governor Stevenson is not so well known as General Eisenhower, and the resentment toward the party in power unquestionably has grown in recent years. If Governor Stevenson does not make a vigorous campaign, and if General Eisenhower does make a vigorous one, anything could happen. It is important to remember that the popular vote four years ago was close. General Eisenhower would have to pick up only a few votes, properly distributed, to win.

Some Democrats have become overconfident partly because of the General's generalizations and his ineffective campaigning to date. But it would be foolhardy to think that he is not holding his fire; his strategy definitely calls for a slow beginning but a rapid build-up as election day draws nearer. The Democrats should take no chances.

Paul Hoffman gave General Eisenhower a good cue the other day when he gave a deposition against Senator McCarthy in the Benton-McCarthy suit. But Ike muffed it. If he had followed the Hoffman lead and gone all-out on the issue of McCarthyism, he would have become a formidable candidate indeed. He would have removed one of the major reasons why independents and many Democrats will not support him. His attempt to be against McCarthyism, but for McCarthy, revealed the basic weakness in the Republican position, and it was a sad comedown for the man who had talked about his political independence. The General will live to regret this.

We have witnessed once more the death of a political party. Four years ago the Dixiecrats, or States' Righters, became a threat to the two-party system. But, largely because they had nothing to offer the South or the rest of the country, the party is now buried. Even if it should come back to life, it probably would be under a different name and with new leaders. Southern leaders like Senators Hill and Sparkman performed yeoman work in opposing the party, and when the Democratic Party stayed united at Chicago the Dixiecrat leaders knew that they were through. Last week in Mississippi, when the state Democrats were performing the final ceremonies, one of the Dixiecrat leaders shouted: "You're killing states' rights as dead as Hector's pup." Actually, they were burying it.

It is important to remember that the party never had a large following. In 1948, nearly 80 percent of the Southern votes cast were anti-Dixiecratic. The Republicans polled more Southern votes in that election than the Dixiecrats.

Many Southerners quickly recognized the party for what it was: A noisy minority of modern Know-Nothings, full of venom toward anyone who wanted to disturb the pattern of life of the Southern small town. In the larger cities, the party had some contributors and a few followers, but its inspiration came from the small towns, many of which have changed little in habit or population in several decades. It was worth some compromises at Chicago to strengthen the hand of Southern progressives and to finish off a party which could have caused only discord.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Secretary of Commerce Sawyer may have been on relatively safe ground, politically speaking, when he denounced Ellis Arnall for warning the people that more inflation lies ahead. But Mr. Sawyer's risky prediction that prices will start downward in October opens him to attack. If he is wrong, he will be made to look silly. Isn't it time, by the way, to recall some of the predictions made by business analysts earlier in the year to the effect that business would fall off and prices would come down this season?

Notes: The more we hear from the men who supported the losers at Chicago the more surprised we are by the bitterness that lingers. It is shocking to hear loyal Democrats who supported Harriman or Kefauver talk with deep bitterness about Stevenson. . . . Again we go into a campaign in which all the servicemen have a decided interest, yet the majority of them know that their states will not permit them to vote absentee in November. . . . In the New Deal days, many charges about big government were campaign talk and nothing else. But we do have big government in an alarming way now. Secretary Lovett called attention to it in his press conference when he urged that the November winner promptly name his Pentagon chiefs so that they could learn at least a little about the huge defense establishment before they take office on January 20. . . . So Bertie McCormick cannot support Ike. That's one feather in the General's cap. If only he would come out against some of the GOP Old Guard, as McCormick has come out against him. . . . While Secretary Sawyer talks optimistically about controlling inflation, it is estimated that the inflation of the last year has cost the government, which is the biggest consumer of all, a neat $900 million. . . . While TV adds immeasurably to public interest in politics, many of the debates and roundtables now seem awfully tame affairs. The Dulles-Harriman debate, for example, must have driven many TV-viewers to the movies. . . . It is hard to say that it is optimism, but there is some feeling here now that perhaps, just perhaps, a solution may come out of the Iranian debâcle. . . .

Washington T.R.B.

CORRESPONDENCE

(Continued from page 2)

different pattern. The Galbraith thesis admittedly betrays inadequacy on his own confession that "under inflationary pressure demand, the whole structure of countervailing power in the economy dissolves." The fact that we have been enjoying the fruits of inflation for the last 20 years—the result of two wars, two deals and deficit financing—doesn't give the new model much of a leg to stand on.

Fortunately, economist Dr. E. G. Nourse, who left the Administration because he could not stomach the deficit financing policy, strikes a more realistic note. He voices this opinion based on observation: "The degree of either intelligence or self-control manifested by our several economic groups in recent years or being currently reflected in the executive and legislative branches of the Administration seem to me to show a progressive deterioration." On a factual basis—the show of unions throwing their weight around, pressure group activities, economically questionable higher wages, the farcical performance of stabilization policy and other similarly embarrassing antics—Dr. Nourse's entry should at least be awarded honorable mention.

The poor batting average of doles, subsidies and promiscuous handouts—to which we have become accustomed—substituting for a "technically correct division of the fruits of production," pinch-hitting for a sound, independent regime, don't get to first base.

Several years ago the President, probably at the instigation of his economic advisers, claimed the United States "has the best business set-up we have ever had." An executive of the Southern California Edison Company came back with a snappy refutation: "This phony prosperity is financed by legal counterfeiting. We are in the most dangerous and unsound boom in our history, and the longer it continues the worse will be the inevitable reaction to the excesses now occurring under the guidance of government economists and planners." Take your choice between ballot-box influenced politicians who pile up expenses, and the practical businessman who foots the bills. Which brings us to the conclusion that, if free enterprise capitalism dies it will be because its too fond friends love it to death, not because it doesn't have the stuff, the makings of a going concern.

Philadelphia, Pa. WALTER SONNEBERG

Republican Viewpoint

● For the first time in my life I am actually going to take pen in hand and write one of the "letters to the editors." . . . And as I undertake this for the first time I feel pleased that it is one complimentary in nature. I write in reference to your article by Sen. Wayne Morse (R, Ore.), "The GOP Platform" (*NR* Aug. 4).

I want to express my congratulations to a publication with avowed Democratic leanings on its publication of an article representing a Republican's viewpoint of Republican affairs. I believe that this is the first time in my reading of Democratic or liberal publications that space has been allotted to Republicans for anything other than name-calling or slander by the other team. Let's have more of the same. Senator Morse, in my estimation, expressed what a great number of Republicans, especially young Republicans, feel their party should do, and if Eisenhower remains untainted by the "Old Guard," will do!

And while I'm sending congratulations, although I am a Republican, I for one appreciate the straight-forward manner in which you announced your Presidential preference. To my way of thinking that is the only honest way for a magazine to support a candidate. Editors, it would seem, being human, are bound to support one group or another and if this assumption is correct, then let's have them do it without subterfuge.

Oxford, Ohio MRS. DOROTHY CETERAS

Security

● I enclose a poem in exchange for just one year's subscription to the *New Republic*, which has now been removed by pressure of reactionaries from our school (Santa Monica High) library.

How like her winning sister Samothrace
She lures by curves and ripples, only more so!
Men need not see the decorous smiling face;
SECURITY the goddess tempts by torso.

In draperies diaphanous she's wooed
Not just the makers of the wars alone;
Whoever hugs Miss Niké in the nude
Soon finds this wingéd woman's not a stone.

Behind the generals, the aides line up
All lusting orderly. She takes command of
Civvies, too, and gloats to feel them sup
Then bolt sweet Liberty (if not the Land of).

Articulate of limb, she thrives with ease—
Keeps prodding, "That will be five drachmas, please."

Pacific Palisades, Calif. ARNOLD LAZARUS

[A subscription to the *New Republic* has been entered and will be sent to Mr. Lazarus with our compliments. – *The Editors.*]

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

VOLUME 127, NUMBER 9, ISSUE 1970, WASHINGTON, D. C., SEPTEMBER 1, 1952

New Republic

"VENOMOUS . . . DIABOLICAL . . . REPREHENSIBLE . . . IRRESPONSIBLE"

JUST TWO YEARS ago, President Truman sent to the Senate the nomination of Gen. George C. Marshall for the office of Secretary of Defense. Twenty-one Republican Senators opposed Marshall's appointment. Among them was Sen. William F. Jenner, Republican, of Indiana. His attack on Marshall, delivered on September 15, 1950, was denounced by a fellow Republican, Sen. Karl Mundt, as "the most venomous, the most diabolical, the most reprehensible, the most unfortunate and irresponsible speech I have ever heard made on the floor of the Senate or of the House of Representatives."

On September 9, 1952, General Eisenhower will deliver a major address in Indianapolis in support of the candidacy of Senator Jenner. Before he frames his endorsement, we ask him to read these passages taken from Jenner's September 15 speech:

". . . We can help the disillusionment of the American people to run its course by exposing Gen. George C. Marshall as a living symbol of the swindle in which we are caught.

"I know full well how General Marshall's prestige has been built up and propagandized across the country and around the world. But I know that this prestige has been made possible only because the true history of this period has been torn up by the roots, locked in State Department and Hyde Park vaults and in the deep freezes of the White House and distorted and perverted and rifled and destroyed.

"Yet in spite of this treachery, this Administration has been unable to alter certain historic facts which have finally wormed their way out to the light of day. These facts in themselves provide conclusive proof that the appointment of Gen. George C. Marshall . . . is a last desperate attempt of this Administration to swallow up the treachery of the past in the new treachery they are planning for the future.

"General Marshall is not only willing, he is eager to play the role of a front man for traitors.

"The truth is this is no new role for him, for Gen. George C. Marshall is a living lie. . . . Everything he has been a party to during the past 10 years has helped to betray his solemn trust and to set the stage for the staggering Soviet victory that is sweeping across the earth. . . .

". . . General Marshall has either been an unsuspecting, well-intentioned stooge, or an actual co-conspirator with the most treasonable array of political cutthroats ever turned loose in the executive branch or our government. . . . "General Marshall knew of the deceit and the duplicity that was indulged in by President Roosevelt during the critical years of 1939, 1940 and 1941. . . . General Marshall knew of the 1,700 messages which passed between Prime Minister Churchill and the late President and of the skullduggery they contained. . . . General Marshall also knew of the plans to invite a Japanese attack. General Marshall was an accomplice in a deliberate conspiracy against the American people, for General Marshall knew better than anyone else . . . that secrecy itself was used to trick the American people into a war they would not have entered in any other way. ". . . General Marshall went along with the most criminal and outrageous betrayals of American interests and principles in history that resulted from Teheran, Yalta and Potsdam. . . .

"General Marshall knew that at Teheran the President tore Europe in two and handed one-half of it, with 100,000,000 people, on a silver platter to Russia.

"General Marshall knew that at Yalta the President did the same thing with regard to Asia. . . . General Marshall knew that behind his complicity, the terrible sacrifices and suffering, the awful casualty lists, and heroic deaths of American GIs . . . had been sacrificed on the bloody altar of power-politics and treason—not to win the war for America, but to destroy the only two powers able to stop the advance of Communist conquest.

"This meant that American GIs were turned into political whipping boys, betrayed by their own Chief of Staff and used for advancing the cause of Communism.

". . . General Marshall knew full well as Chief of Staff . . . that the Teheran Conference set the stage for the sell-out of Europe.

"He knew it called for a betrayal of Poland.

"He knew it called for a sell-out of Czechoslovakia. . . .

"General Marshall knew of the outrageous plan for the treatment of Germany. . . .

"General Marshall knew that General Patton was relieved from his command for daring to warn the American people on September 22, 1945, of what was going on in Europe.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"General Marshall knew of the outrageous agreement which turned our zone of occupation in Berlin into a Russian prison. . . .

"Gen. George C. Marshall knew what outrageous lies were used to cover up the Yalta sell-out of the Orient. For he knew that, while American GIs were fighting and dying on the bloody beaches of Okinawa and Iwo Jima and Saipan, the outrageous deal was made, selling out the Orient to Russia as a so-called necessary price for Russia's one-week participation in the war against Japan, after it had already been won was a deliberate sell-out to Russia.

". . . There is one more awful fact which history holds against General Marshall, and that is, that . . . General Marshall knew better than anyone else that America's future was being bartered away by a dying President who had fallen into the hands of an unscrupulous treasonable clique who by their every word and conniving act proved they were determined to destroy us.

" . . . Can Gen. George C. Marshall show the American people one single major accomplishment to his credit which succeeded in defending us from the awful consequences of these treacherous designs?

" . . . If General Marshall had retired in 1945, history would have been unkind enough. But General Marshall was not content to go halfway with this treasonable conspiracy; he has gone the whole way.

"He knew that the United Nations was being set up as nothing but a ruthless instrument of power-politics. . . .

"It was General Marshall himself who on July 11, O.K.d a memorandum for the President dealing with the set-up of Dumbarton Oaks, by recommending: 'Mr. Alger Hiss will act as executive secretary.'

" . . . General Marshall lent all his great prestige and power to the Jessup-Lattimore-Service-Acheson line calling for a cessation of the civil war, paralyzing the Nationalist Government, and the withholding of aid from Chiang, while he knew all the time that the Russians were not only taking over Manchuria and Northern China, but were being rearmed by captured Japanese equipment and were preparing for the eventual conquest not only of China but of the whole Far East.

"Our boys are dying in Korea as a result.

" . . . General Marshall is still proud of this role he played as the inaugurator of the 'sell-China-down-the-river' line. . . . Having set the stage for the sell-out of China, including Korea, and Japan, General Marshall was appointed Secretary of State, where he continued this pro-Communist policy in the Far East. . . .

"On the other hand, General Marshall launched the so-called Marshall Plan idea for the recovery of Europe which has been hailed as a masterful stroke of statesmanship . . . again it is difficult for the American people to understand the extent of the swindle in which we are caught . . . the Marshall Plan has been pouring into Soviet hands the war materials and potential which has enabled her to continue her fantastic armaments race and her growing conquest of the world.

" . . . As a result of everything General Marshall has been a party to, America now finds herself not out on a limb, but out on the end of a twig, committed over our heads to the squandering of our resources across the earth, to the turning of American Armed Forces into a permanent foreign legion, to the turning of this government of ours into a military dictatorship, run by the Communist-appeasing, Communist-protecting betrayer of America, Secretary of State Dean Acheson. . . .

"Unless he [General Marshall], himself, were desperate, he could not possibly agree to continue as an errand boy, a front man, a stooge or a co-conspirator for this Administration's crazy assortment of collectivist cutthroat crackpots and Communist fellow-traveling appeasers. . . . General Marshall . . . is . . . setting the stage for a repetition in the future on a grander scale of the chicanery . . . and betrayals of the past. . . .

"It is tragic . . . that General Marshall is not enough of a patriot to tell the American people the truth of what has happened, and the terrifying story of what lies in store for us, instead of joining hands once more with the criminal crowd of traitors and Communist appeasers, who, under the continuing influence and direction of Mr. Truman and Mr. Acheson, are still selling America down the river."

That is Jenner. And far worse than his factual untruths is his attribution of treacherous intent to Eisenhower's lifelong friend and sponsor, George Marshall, culminating in the charge that Marshall's purpose in seeking the defeat of Hitler and Tojo was "to destroy the only two powers able to stop the advance of Communist conquest."

That is not merely "venomous." It is Fascist-minded.

Does it then belong in Eisenhower's "great crusade" to "unite us where we have been divided; to strengthen freedom . . . to build a sure foundation . . . for a just and sure peace"? Is it part of the "noble service," the "shining promise of tomorrow" to which Eisenhower dedicated himself in his acceptance speech?

We ask General Eisenhower:

Would you vote for William F. Jenner if you were a resident of Indiana?

If not, can you in good conscience urge others to vote for him?

If so, what has become of your "great crusade for freedom in America and freedom in the world"?

We ask these questions hoping for the right replies.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Charles C. Sherrod Library
EAST TENNESSEE STATE COLLEGE
Johnson City, Tennessee

THE WEEK

THE CAMPAIGN

The week of campaign exchanges left good and bad marks on both sides:

Eisenhower

Plus—He rejected MacArthur's policy of war against China.

Plus—He shed Col. Robert R. McCormick.

Minus—He endorsed McCarthy. He condemned "witchhunts," called smears "un-American," praised General Marshall as a "patriot" whom McCarthy branded as a traitor. Then he added that all these were less important to him than party regularity and asked Wisconsin voters to return McCarthy to the Senate, thus giving him veto power over State Department appropriations. He went on to praise the American Legion's anti-Communist program although the Legion has spearheaded the attack on freedom of speech in libraries, schools, movies, theaters and radio programs from Boston through Peoria to Hollywood.

Stevenson

Plus—He took a forthright stand on tidelands oil, thus risking the loss of Texas, and foregoing the immense campaign contributions of California oil man Ed Pauley and his friends, the main financial underwriters of the 1948 victory.

Minus—In referring to the "mess" in Washington and the need for change he climbs down from the heights of his acceptance address and went too far in criticizing Truman. There are weaknesses in the Administration; they are less important than its strong points. If voters want change more than continuity they will vote for Eisenhower.

KURT SCHUMACHER

Kurt Schumacher was easily the most enigmatic political leader in postwar Europe. No one person hated dictatorship, of either the Hitler or Stalin variety, more violently than this shrunken, one-armed veteran of the concentration camp. Yet many who saw him beat his followers into undeviating acceptance of his strategy, wondered if the long-time Democratic Socialist had not become the unconscious captive of the tactics he despised. No one could be more eloquent than Schumacher in pledging allegiance to international ideals, and yet none of the old-line Social Democrats could muster even a semblance of the ferocious ridicule which Schumacher heaped on the Schuman Plan, the Council of Europe and other political bodies sponsored by his arch-rival, Adenauer.

Schumacher wanted power for his nation, self-confidence for his people. The first of these aims is close to realization thanks more to Adenauer's shrewdness than to Schumacher's belligerency. The second is probably delayed by the dead-end road of nationalism down which he drove his once internationally-minded party.

SECRET OIL

The lengthy and "secret" report on an international oil cartel, compiled by Federal Trade Commission experts, has finally been released by President Truman at the urging of Democratic Vice-Presidential nominee John Sparkman in his capacity as head of the Senate Committee on Small Business.

The report, veiled in secrecy for almost two years, shows how seven major oil companies—five American and two British-Dutch—have controlled the production, price and distribution of oil in most countries outside the hegemony of the Soviet Union.

The report purports to show how the cartel has channeled the history of Middle Eastern and South American governments to their own advantages, although many sections containing such facts were deleted at State Department request.

Most of the major companies have replied to the report disclaiming any cartel-like arrangement, saying that their operations have been conducted with the full knowledge of the United States Government. They refused to take advantage of two days of hearings set aside by Senator Sparkman for their special case to be heard. Unquestionably more will be brought out during a pending Grand Jury investigation.

STEEL AND LIVING COSTS

The nation's economists, attempting to foretell the effect of the recently instituted steel-price increase of $5.20 a ton, appear to be gazing into slightly different crystal balls. And, interestingly enough, top government officials are chief spokesmen for two divergent groups.

Price Stabilizer Ellis Arnall, who had vigorously opposed the price increase, has estimated that it will cost the average American family about $100 this year. On the other hand, Charles Sawyer, Secretary of Commerce, is saying that the steel settlement will have no drastic or immediate effect upon consumer prices.

Arnall's statement was believed to be concerned with the general contributory effect of the steel-price increase over the consumer's-price index which has risen steadily since February. The latest report, just issued by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, sets another new consumer-price record of 190.8 of the 1935-39 base period for July 15, 1952. Food and rents account for most of the increase.

Sawyer said that there were two principle reasons for his statement. One was the unusually high pre-strike inventory of steel and appliances. The second was the consumer resistance to high prices.

The one point which most economists do agree upon is that there will be a steady upward trend in cost of living of one to two percent annually, consumer resistance notwithstanding. Most government economists feel that this "slow inflation" is healthy—providing for an expanding economy, increasing inventories and a constantly rising standard of living.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE VATICAN AND THE KREMLIN

THE RELATIONSHIP between the Vatican and the Kremlin seems to be even more important for either in some ways than is the relationship between either and the White House and State Department. For the Vatican, the importance stems from judgments made in the perspective of the long-term historical evolution of Catholic Christendom. For the Kremlin, the frame of reference is the pattern of immediate political needs of a strategy of world power.

These facts tend to be confirmed by two recent events. The first was the unusual, if not unprecedented, personal letter—*"Sacro vergente anno"*—sent personally and directly by Pope Pius to the "Russian peoples" on July 7, the feast day of Saints Cyril and Methodius. The second was the exceptionally cordial reception given by Marshal Stalin and the hierarchs of the Politburo to Pietro Nenni, the leader of the fellow-traveling Italian Socialist Party on the occasion of his visit to Moscow.

For the Vatican, the Kremlin is, of course—as it is for the American Government—first and foremost the world headquarters of universalist Communism and aggressive Soviet imperialism. But it is also the most dangerous front of atheistic materialism. And, far more important from the Vatican's perspective, it is the present ruler of the peoples of what was under the Tsars "Holy Russia," of the many millions of communicants of the Eastern Orthodox Catholic Church, the heir of Byzantium.

When the Tsars were the "Little Fathers" of these millions of Catholics, most of them deeply religious, Russia was totally cut off from Roman Catholicism. Yet Rome never gave up its hope of healing the ancient breach and of "winning back" the "erring" faithful. Then, in 1917, the religious "Iron Curtain" which the Old Regime of Russia had maintained for centuries seemed to be lifted.

One of the first acts of the Provisional Government of Russia after the first "liberal" revolution in March of that year was to proclaim religious freedom. The almost immediate response in Rome was the creation of the Congregation of the Eastern Church, and a number of organizations designed to take advantage of the opportunity in order to "win back" the Russian Christians to the faith and authority of the See of Saint Peter. Other even more significant steps were also taken. One of these was the official acceptance of the authenticity of the vision of Fatima in Portugal. The Church stood behind an incident which was said to have taken place there: three children had a vision of the Virgin and told shepherds that, if the message they had were heeded, Russia would be converted and there would be peace in the world.

After the Communists took over control, the Vatican's basic struggle in Russia was against atheistic materialism. But Communism changed with the passage of time: not only did it arrogate to itself the authority of a kind of anti-religious religion but it also showed signs of tolerating Orthodox Catholic Christianity, indeed of using it for its own political purposes. Hence, the Pope's letter in July has been interpreted as joining an issue, of competing with the Kremlin for the souls of the Russians.

Politically, moreover, there is an aspect of the present manifestation of the long-term view that makes it extremely topical. In point of time, the Pope's letter coincided with the public appearance on the US national scene of the Dulles Doctrine—of the policy which would replace containment by "liberation." This doctrine has been inserted in the campaign platform of the Republican Party. A version of it has been personally espoused by General Eisenhower.

But whereas the GOP liberation is physical and material, to be achieved by all methods short of war (and some flirting with the danger of war), the Papal form is moral and spiritual. In addition, the Pope's language is mild and careful, far less strong than was used by the Vatican during the period of the religious "cold war" in the satellite countries. The Romans, expert in the Vatican's ways, see a plain suggestion that though the Holy See is profoundly, permanently, totally opposed to the Kremlin's machinations, indeed to its very existence, the Church of Rome is in no frantic hurry. It can wait, expects to wait, and is waiting for rather different developments in Soviet Russia.

Nenni's visit to Moscow, his reception there, his conduct and statements since his return, also lend themselves to interpretation. He denied the Alsop's story that he had been assigned to feel out the Americans, especially Ambassador Kennan through the Italian Ambassador in Moscow, about the chances for a lessening of Soviet-US tension. Yet it was obvious that he came back to Italy as the Kremlin's "chosen instrument"—at least temporarily more powerful than Palmiro Togliatti—not only in Rome and in Italy, but in terms of general Western policy. As the London *Times* pointed out, the Soviet leaders:

> . . . largely owe [to Nenni] the preservation of a considerable degree of working class unity in Italy, as well as more recently, some effective propaganda work for the "peace" and "neutralist" campaign. In him they can discern the Trojan horse so dear to Communist tacticians in countries not under their control. . . . As next year's general elections in Italy draw near, so the power of Signor Nenni and his followers to influence and confuse the Italian working class remains great as ever.

Italy, moreover, is a test case, the proving ground for the Kremlin's present policy of "all class unity" and united front" against "Fascism and war." The Manchester *Guardian* sees the danger of the emergence of a Franco-type Italian government. The London *Observer* says:

> At this moment most genuine Italian liberals would have no hesitation in making an alliance with the Communists, if the alternative were resurgent Fascism. . . . The right-wing of the Christian Democratic Party is now pursuing the scarcely concealed object of forcing the party into an alliance with the Monarchists and Fascists. And it is no secret that in this object it has the support of the Vatican and the Church hierarchy.

Rome PERCY WINNER

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WHO IS RICHARD NIXON?

by Ernest Brashear

WHO IS Richard Nixon? What does he stand for? How did he become Eisenhower's running mate just five years after he entered politics? Almost no one knows the answer to these questions. And yet the Bank of America executive who threw Nixon's hat in the political ring in 1945 predicted a few days ago that "our boy Dick" will be elected President of the United States in 1956 or 1960.

This forecast by financier Herman L. Perry (modestly described as "a friend" by *Time* magazine) adds credence to the general belief that Nixon views his current role as Vice-Presidential candidate as an express highway—rather than a dead-end street—on his route to the highest office in the land.

At the same time, Perry revealed that the charming fairy tale about Richard Nixon's entrance into public life is nothing more than a fairy tale after all.

As the story goes, a group of 100 public-spirited citizens made a newspaper appeal for a Congressional candidate they could support in the 12th California District in the election of 1946. The young, curly-haired Nixon, then a lieutenant-commander in the Navy, responded by flying home just in time to appear at the 100's last meeting for interviewing prospects. He made his 10-minute pitch, as had other hopefuls, received 88 of the 100 votes and was made the group's unanimous choice for the job.

The most widely circulated account appeared in the March 19, 1949, issue of the *Saturday Evening Post* which labeled Nixon the "people's choice" and an "amateur candidate" of "amateur politicians." Numerous newspapers have reprinted the yarn. Even the fact-worshipping *Congressional Quarterly* repeated the anecdote in its July 11, 1952, issue.

It's a good story, full of drama for the Horatio Alger addicts, but it isn't strictly true. The facts are as follows:

For 10 years the distressed Republicans had been trying to beat the 12th District's incumbent Rep. Jerry Voorhis, an outstanding liberal and advocate of good government. Even gerrymandering had been tried by the Republican-controlled California Legislature which clipped 13,000 normally Democratic votes out of the district.

Behind the anxious efforts to beat Voorhis were the monied California oil producers, the banking interests and the private utilities. Their reasons were obvious. Besides being a New Dealer, Representative Voorhis was a spokesman for federal control of tidelands oil, cheap credit, co-operatives and public power.

In the fall of 1945, a group of businessmen and bankers met in the San Morino area to explore the bleak election possibilities for 1946. They drew up specifications for a candidate. He must be a veteran, young and personable, with some education. He must be a Republican in favor of state ownership of tidelands (which means millions to oilmen) and opposed to government controls and other forms of "New Deal Socialism." No one, it turned out, knew such a prospect. Another conference was held, this time with John Barcome, chairman of the Republican Central Committee, Roy Day, Republican district chairman, and other long-time party leaders. They agreed to form a candidate-finding Committee of 100, the membership to consist of all GOP officials in the district, officers of GOP clubs and a smattering of representative party workers.

Roy Day was named chairman and instructed to set four open meetings for candidate interview and selection. After the first public session, when only two prospects—neither tailored to specification—were suggested, the financiers got together again in a private huddle. Herman Perry, head of the Bank of America in the prosperous citrus and avocado county of Whittier, proposed the name of Richard Nixon, a graduate of Whittier High School and Whittier College, an honor winner at Duke University Law School, 32 years old, a Quaker of a long-established Republican family. Two questions were asked: Is he a Republican? Is he available?

Perry immediately dispatched a wire to Nixon, who was currently working on Navy contracts in a Baltimore office. Nixon responded by long-distance phone, said he was very much available and that "he guessed he was a Republican because he voted for Tom Dewey in 1944." He agreed to fly home to present his case to the banking and business group.

Meanwhile, before Nixon arrived, Perry wrote a personal letter to each of the 100 committee members describing the qualifications and extolling the virtues of his candidate. When the handsome young lawyer appeared, there was almost no opposition. The stage had been set, the word had been given, and the selection was made in line with "politics as usual." It was not the Original Amateur Hour as reported.

Subsequent events, however, proved the politicians could hardly have made a better choice for their purposes. Their boy was smart, he was fresh and he could talk. Voorhis was inveigled into a series of debates. On one side was the youthful Nixon, handsome, dramatic

Ernest Brashear is Labor Editor of the Los Angeles Daily News.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and persuasive. On the other—a sober, thoughtful, self-effacing liberal.

Almost immediately Nixon took off on the issue of Communism and managed to give the impression that Voorhis, the liberal, was indistinguishable from a Communist Party member because he had received unsolicited endorsements from a few organizations in which Communists were active.

Even so, many observers believe that the success of Nixon's histrionics over the troubled and searching talks of Voorhis were not decisive in influencing voters. More important were the anonymous telephone calls that citizens throughout the 12th District began to receive. "This is a friend of yours, but I can't tell you my name," the unknown voice would say. "I just wanted you to know that Jerry Voorhis is a Communist." Sometimes the caller would hang up; at other times a quotation or misquotation would be given to support the claim.

It worked. Nixon won by a vote of 64,784 to 49,431, and his political career, labeled "meteoric" in his official biography, was under way. Two years later, he easily defeated Steve Zetterberg, Voorhis' former secretary, in his bid for re-election.

Then, in the off-year election of 1950, the clean-cut young man from Whittier ran for the United States Senate and defeated Fair Deal favorite Helen Gahagan Douglas in one of the best-financed, well-publicized and most underhanded campaigns in California's history.

By late 1949, when Representative Nixon announced his candidacy for the Senate, any idea that he was a free-wheeling amateur and not a party regular had been destroyed by the ready availability of campaign dollars and by his voting record, which closely paralleled those of Reps. Everett Dirksen (R, Ill.) and Joe Martin (R, Mass.). In fact, he was so acceptable that another Republican hopeful, County Supervisor Raymond V. Darby of Los Angeles, was quietly shoved out of the race to leave Nixon more running room.

Darby, excited about his prospects early in 1949 for defeating Sen. Sheridan Downey, had begun sounding out the men who run the GOP. He was encouraged with pledges of support, particularly from financial backers close to the Los Angeles *Times*, the mother-hen of the conservative Republican movement in California. Then, when Downey unexpectedly announced his withdrawal, there was considerable embarrassment. Nixon, beloved by oil, banking, utilities and big-money interests generally, wanted to run. The Republican high command was for him immediately. But what to do about Darby was a problem. A plan was worked out. Darby was told that he couldn't have the first prize, but if he'd agree to leave quietly, he would receive official GOP support as candidate for lieutenant-governor under Republican Gov. Earl Warren. The incumbent, Lt.-Gov. Goodwin Knight, would drop out and leave Darby a clear field, they said. Darby agreed. Then came the double-cross. Knight did not withdraw; he ran with state wide blessing of the Republican Party. Darby got "official GOP support" in the form of a naked endorsement from the Los Angeles *Times*. As an unwanted candidate, he received a terrific trouncing from Knight.

The Darby deal, however, left Nixon with a wide-open field, a ready-made platform to campaign on and plenty of money to see that his message got across. Even so, when Nixon declared his candidacy on November 3, 1949, there was some question about the intended targets of his campaign.

> Believe me, I am well aware of the Communist threat and I do not discount it [he told his audience at a dinner in his honor]. But I am convinced that *an even greater threat* to our free institutions is presented by that group of hypocritical and cynical men who, under the guise of providing political panaceas for certain social and economic problems in our society, are selling the American birthright for a mess of pottage.

The plain implication was that he would focus his attack on the "even greater threat" posed by Fair Deal programs and let the issue of Communism tag along in second place.

The following February, however, Nixon announced that he was going to campaign on the basis of anti-Communism. Since Communist aggression in Korea was not at that time an issue, it appears that Representative Nixon's own decision was a mite "hypocritical and cynical." The young Red-hunter obviously hoped to capitalize on his publicity from the Alger Hiss case and considered a forthright stand against Marxism a far more defensible position than many of the Republican platforms on domestic policy.

History was on his side. By the time the June primaries were over and he was nominated to face Helen Gahagan Douglas in the final election, Korea was afire and his course was automatically laid out for him. The premise of his campaign was simple, but effective: Mrs. Douglas, an ardent advocate of resistance to aggression, was one of the most effective enemies of the Communist Party. Yet, in the course of thousands of votes cast in the wartime and postwar years, she, like every Representative who fought Hitler abroad and inflation at home, had voted 354 times in the same way that Vito Marcantonio, the American Labor Party spokesman from New York, had cast his ballot. That, said Nixon, made her a Stalinist at heart.

That accusation, pounded out over and over again, in

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

public appearances, on radio and television, in newspapers and pink-tinted leaflets, had a fearful impact on a citizenry which, a few weeks before, had seen Korea flame up in what seemed a prelude to inevitable all-out war with Russia. Anti-Communist sentiment was at an hysterical peak. Nixon, a powerful and convincing speaker, a tireless campaigner, made the most of this Moscow-created opportunity.

Helen Douglas' heart was set on a constructive campaign, seeking solutions for the mounting urban and rural problems of California. Heartsick, she turned to her own defense, protesting her opposition to Communism. She listed her many votes for measures aimed at crippling the Reds—the Marshall Plan, for example, which Marcantonio opposed. She demonstrated that most Representatives, both Democrat and Republican, built up a voting record similar to Marcantonio's when Russia's interest paralleled our own. She even pointed out that Nixon voted with Marcantonio against financial aid to Korea on January 19, 1950, just six months before the North Korean aggression, a vote interpreted in Moscow as confirmation that Congress would allow the Republic of Korea to be invaded and overrun.

She might just as well have said nothing.

The simple fact was that Nixon's story was hammered into the consciousness of virtually every voter in California in a campaign that experts estimate must have cost at least $1 million and possibly twice that amount. Mrs. Douglas' defense—and defense against a half-truth is well-nigh impossible to get across—reached a pitiful minority of the independent voters.

Some concept of the favorable treatment Nixon received during the campaign is illustrated in an analysis of 12 representative California newspapers made at the Stanford University Institute for Journalistic Studies. Two of the 12 newspapers were Douglas supporters, nine backed Nixon and one was neutral. The pro-Douglas pair had a total daily circulation of 265,397. The nine pro-Nixon newspapers totaled 1,322,895—almost exactly five times as much daily circulation.

The Sunday newspaper circulation of 2,027,332 was all provided by pro-Nixon publications since neither of the pro-Douglas papers had a Sunday edition.

Total circulation for the week, including the one Sunday and six daily issues, showed 9,964,702 pro-Nixon issues each seven days compared to 1,592,382 issues of the pro-Douglas papers. Thus, Nixon supporters had well over six times as many readers as did the Douglas backers.

Content analysis of all news items, excluding editorial comment, reflected the strongly anti-Douglas bias. The Hearst-owned Los Angeles *Examiner*, circulation 357,453 daily and 827,051 Sunday, during the survey period published 235 statements about Mrs. Douglas. Researchers classified 67 percent of them unfavorable and only two percent favorable. Of 300 *Examiner* items about Nixon, 65 percent were listed as favorable.

The bitterly Republican Los Angeles *Times*, circulation 385,583 daily and 782,953 Sunday, ran 825 items about Mrs. Douglas, 59 percent unfavorable and 22 percent favorable. Nixon got 819 items, only five percent unfavorable and 62 percent favorable. Each of these papers had more daily circulation than the two Douglas supporters combined and, as mentioned before, Mrs. Douglas had no Sunday paper support at all.

This was free publicity for Nixon, and it tells only a minor part of the story because the other kinds of campaign promotion were almost as lopsided in Nixon's favor despite the miraculous fact that expenditures for his election, as reported to the California Secretary of State, equalled less than half the amount spent for Mrs. Douglas.

Organizations supporting Nixon reported only $62,899—the lowest amount spent on behalf of any of six candidates for the three most hotly contested jobs. Gov. Earl Warren naïvely recorded $324,000; Mrs. Douglas listed $156,172; Warren's Democratic opponent, James Roosevelt, showed $95,971. Even the two rivals for state attorney-general, Edmund G. Brown and Edward S. Shattuck, reported $94,002 and $115,338 respectively.

The unaccountably low figure for spending on Nixon's behalf is made even more mystifying by such quotes as these from Drew Pearson:

> The two candidates with the greatest amounts to spend on billboards appear to be Taft in Ohio and Nixon in California [Pearson reported on November 4, 1950]. Nixon has so much money that he even puts billboards across the border in Mexico.

And:

> The editor of a newspaper on the outskirts of Los Angeles tells how he was offered $1,000 in Nixon advertising if he would come out editorially for Nixon. He refused. . . .

Residents of California during the campaign recall that Nixon's picture began peering at them from billboards all over the state in April, two months before the primary, and that the face got more and more familiar on more and more billboards through August, September and October.

Since it would have cost $25,000 a month for a single statewide billboard series, and since Nixon had about seven months of fairly constant coverage, it seems reasonable that the cost for this form of advertising alone would have been $175,000.

There were, of course, other items of expense for the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

big campaign such as newspaper advertising, radio and television time, mailings to voters, printing charges, office rental, staff salaries and transportation. An old rule-of-thumb among campaign managers is that billboards should take up about 10 to 15 percent of the budget. If that was the case in the Nixon campaign, its total cost would have been $1.1 million to $1.75 million.

But such calculation is obviously at fault in Nixon's case because the amount reported was only $62,899.

The astoundingly low cost must have caused even winning candidate Nixon to marvel, for in September, 1949, while he was smelling out possible financial support for the race, the boy orator from Whittier estimated that an all-out drive would require at least $100,000. And pre-campaign estimates are notoriously low.

Nixon found that plenty of money was available to him. A chunk of $5,000 came from as far away as Maine, where Sen. Owen Brewster admitted he had borrowed $10,000 to split between the candidacies of Nixon and Sen. Milton R. Young (R, N. Dak.). Congress was interested in Brewster's funds since the intermediary who transferred them from Maine to California in violation of Republican National Committee rules was a notorious contact- and pay-off man, Henry Grunewald, whose relations with the underworld are still a concern of Congressional investigators.

A major share of Nixon's support came, directly or indirectly, from the wealthy owners of California's oil, private utilities and corporation farms, men well aware of the real issues in the Nixon-Douglas campaign.

Communism, the issue on which they beat Mrs. Douglas, was hogwash. Neither Nixon nor Mrs. Douglas was a Communist or a sympathizer, and every informed Californian knew it.

Mrs. Douglas was in favor of federal ownership of oil tidelands, the off-shore reservoir estimated to contain 20 billion invaluable barrels of oil, an untapped resource on which the nation's life might depend in event of a third world war. Nixon favored the oilmen's stand for state ownership, a stand based on the simple truth that a state legislature is far easier and cheaper to buy than the federal government.

Mrs. Douglas stood further for public power and irrigation projects such as the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) and Columbia Valley Authority (CVA) and the public distribution of power at low rates. Nixon, and the big utilities, preferred the private distribution of power and the higher, profit-compounding rates.

Mrs. Douglas was for maintaining the present law which provides that water from California's Central Valley Project, when it is completed, cannot be given to farmers who own more than 160 acres. The big landowners, like the Kern County Land Company with its 354,000 acres, wanted to get in on the reclamation project benefits by having the law changed. Nixon was for them. These—along with the broad national problems of health insurance and other social and economic security programs—were the major issues. Mrs. Douglas attempted to build her campaign around them. Nixon passed over them, briefly and without emphasis. Nixon did not fight Mrs. Douglas. He fought Vito Marcantonio, the Communist sympathizer, and garrotted Mrs. Douglas politically with the strands of unreasoning hatred and fear that the association of Marcantonio's name brought forth.

Two pieces of literature used in the campaign were memorable, the Pink Sheet and the "Fellow Democrats" Letter. In the final weeks, crews operating under war veteran Joe Holt, who is himself a candidate for Congress in California's 22nd District this fall, showed up at every Douglas rally and distributed pink-tinted leaflets to her audience. The pink sheets contained a cleverly distorted account of Mrs. Douglas' voting record and made it appear she consistently voted with Marcantonio, carefully ignoring the many harshly anti-Communist measures she fought and voted for.

Omitted were such actions as her battle for the Atomic Energy Act, public housing, military aid to Europe, the Marshall Plan and repeated votes for aid to Korea. Also omitted were two Nixon votes against Korean aid and one vote to cut military aid to Europe in 1949—votes in which Marcantonio agreed with Nixon.

The Pink Sheet was a big and masterful lie, convincingly done.

Some weeks earlier, before the primary, thousands of registered Democrats were bombarded with mail pieces inscribed on the outside: "As One Democrat to Another." Inside was a photo of Nixon and a tale about his part in the Hiss case. Among recipients of the circular was Will Rogers Jr., a former Representative and well-known Democratic leader who was active in the campaign against Nixon. Leslie E. Claypool, dean of Los Angeles political writers, commented: "It was surprising that a man who poses as the soul of truth and honor would permit such a deceitful device to be used to fool thousands of Democrats new to this country." Surprising? Many such devices were used. One was the entrance into California of a man who asked no recognition from Nixon yet spoke throughout the state for him as part of Nixon's double-level campaign. His name was Joseph McCarthy.

Part II of "Who Is Richard Nixon" will appear in the next issue of the New Republic.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

TIME AND TAFT-HARTLEY

by Joseph E. Finley

WHILE SOME labor spokesmen continue to attack the Taft-Hartley Act in broad, meaningless clichés that have long ago lost their effect on a tired public, tough employers are finding the drawn-out, orderly processes of the law a useful weapon in their struggles to keep unorganized plants free of the taint of unionism. At the same time, some of the legalistic changes made by Senator Taft's law, not yet generally denounced, are proving to be added allies. To the small, newly formed union this combination is devastating.

A CIO Steelworkers local in Worcester, Mass., trying for 15 years to organize the Reed and Prince Company, makers of screws and bolts, has been practically ruined by the technique of legal starvation. Even under the Wagner Act delays of the law had its perils. But with some of Taft-Hartley's undercover provisions added to its difficulties, the union faces a doubtful struggle to survive.

Back in 1937, the union first enrolled enough of Reed and Prince's 900 employees to call a strike for recognition. A state court injunction and several of the popular anti-labor tactics of that era broke the strike. Unfair labor-practice charges were filed before the National Labor Relations Board.

Not until 1939 did an overworked NLRB hand down a decision ordering Reed and Prince to bargain with the union. It took until 1941 for the United States Court of Appeals in Boston to back up the Board's order on appeal. Then, Reed and Prince, determined to go the legal limit, turned to the Supreme Court. The petition to review the decision of the Appeals Court was turned down, and for the first time Reed and Prince was legally compelled to bargain.

But after four years, there was no union left to sit at the other side of the table. The United Steelworkers carefully made their attempts to reorganize the factory. Not until 1950 did they feel strong enough to call for an NLRB election, which they won easily. Then, the long, slow bargaining process started all over again. Reed and Prince calmly offered the same kind of contract it granted in 1941, and no more. In January, 1951, the union again went on strike, unfair-practice charges were filed before the NLRB, and the long legal process was once more under way.

A Senate Labor Subcommittee, consisting of Senators Humphrey (D, Minn.) and Morse (R, Ore.), investigated the strike and brought company and union officials to Washington to give their stories. Reed and Prince spokesmen told the Senators they just didn't want a union in their factory and were prepared to take any legal step to prevent it.

How these legal steps work under Taft-Hartley is better shown by a current case out of Kentucky, where the employers' lawyers recognize the new tools handed to them by the new law.

A small clay factory, whose owner has a long record of hostility to labor unions, was organized in 1948. For this insult to his employment relations, the owner offered to cut wages, vacations and other benefits. The union gave up and called a strike. Immediately, every union man in the plant was fired and replacements who were willing to cross a picket line were taken on. Unfair labor-practice charges were filed before the NLRB.

Processing such complaints require long months of time. In 1948, Paul L. Herzog, chairman of the NLRB, testified before the Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations that it required an average of 631 days from the time a complaint was filed until the Board handed down a decision. In 1949, the Board found the Kentucky clay-factory owner guilty of a refusal to bargain and ordered reinstatement of the fired strikers.

Both sides dug in for the long legal winter. When the NLRB asked the Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit to enforce its order, the employer countered with a motion to send the case back to the Board to take "new evidence." A court not too friendly to labor granted this motion in 1950. Additional testimony was taken, and in 1951 the NLRB made a new order, still finding the employer guilty of unfair practices. A few weeks ago the Court upheld the Board's findings and ordered the fired employees reinstated.

But the legal fight is far from ended. The employer has a right to ask for a re-hearing, which is almost always denied, but it eats up more time. When the re-hearing is denied, the employer will probably turn toward the Supreme Court with a petition for *certiorari*, asking the high court to hear his case. That will be denied late in 1952 or in early 1953. Once again, the employer can ask for a re-hearing on this denial. These are routinely denied, and finally, in 1953, the clay factory will be under a binding order to bargain collectively with the union and reinstate the fired strikers with back

Joseph Finley is a Washington attorney engaged in the practice of labor law.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pay—five years after the original dispute had occurred.

But the union was totally destroyed in 1948. And while the labor law has changed, a workingman's need to eat has not. With high levels of employment, the ousted employees have had little difficulty in finding other jobs. Since the plant owner has only to make good their actual losses, his outlay will be small, if any. Even if he is forced to pay a few thousand dollars, it is still a cheap price for not having a union in his plant for five years.

At this stage, two of the most subtle and least-noticed changes in the law help out the determined employer. Under the Wagner Act even though these legal delays were possible, as shown by the first Reed and Prince case, a union was reasonably sure of eventually winning its battle. But now, a strike leader who returns to his job after the long court fighting is risking his family on borrowed time.

Before Taft-Hartley, a Court of Appeals was bound by law to uphold an NLRB finding if "supported by evidence." That meant that the NLRB, using its special knowledge of labor-management practices, could single out a discriminatory firing if there were some evidence to sustain it and courts had to back up that finding.

The Taft-Hartley Act struck out that provision and wrote in a new one, "if supported by substantial evidence on the whole record." Then it wrote in another section binding the NLRB to the rules for taking evidence which are used in courtrooms. Courtroom rules are far more technical and restrictive than the flexible practices of administrative agencies like the NLRB, and thus it is more difficult to find "substantial evidence."

That term, "substantial evidence," snapped open the judicial handcuffs. Now a judge may use his own idea of what is substantial, and if it differs from the Board's idea, he is free to reverse the NLRB. A 1951 Supreme Court case confirmed that Taft-Hartley had made a sharp change in the law. Immediately afterward, the distinguished Judge Learned Hand interpreted the new provision to mean, " . . . we deem ourselves as competent as the Board to pass upon issues of fact [in unfair-practice cases]." Another federal judge, in a recent decision, had his crack at the new loophole. "The amendments to the Act require a stricter construction . . . [now] courts have a much broaded sphere of action in determining what orders are to be enforced." This "much broader sphere" can be disastrous to labor in the hands of unfriendly judges.

Thus, the Kentucky clay-factory strikers, who may have their jobs back in 1953, would be foolish to leave a secure job to return to an employer who is openly and avowedly anti-union. The owner may now look for "cause" to fire them, and that may be any minor infraction of stiff rules he may want to impose. The only remedy would be another unfair-practice charge. The strict rules of evidence would make a discriminatory firing hard to prove, and then even if the Board so held, its decision would have to undergo the stern scrutiny of a Court of Appeals looking for "substantial evidence." In addition, another four- to five-year struggle through the courts would exhaust any workingman.

These tactics of stalling behind legal delay work best in the smaller, less-industrialized communities where the benefits of collective bargaining are most needed. Strikebreakers at the Kentucky clay factory, for example, had little hesitancy about crossing a picket-line to take the jobs offered. And, to add to the union's indignities, the employer brought suit in a federal court, alleging violation of Taft-Hartley's secondary boycott provisions and asking for a quarter of a million dollars in damages. This suit is currently dragging its way through the courts, consuming years and enormous costs.

When the Senate Subcommittee held its Reed and Prince hearings, a Steelworkers' lawyer suggested that the injunction weapon used so often against labor be turned on employers. This opened another Taft-Hartley wound to labor and pricked at one of the statute's most one-sided provisions.

When the 80th Congress outlawed so-called secondary boycotts, it wrote in a provision that made it compulsory for NLRB officials to go into a federal court and seek an injunction as soon as a complaint was filed against a union. Another injunction section was written in, too, but this one allows NLRB officials, if they choose, to seek an order against "any person" committing an unfair labor practice. "Any person" means Reed and Prince and the Kentucky clay factory owner, as well as labor unions. But this section lies dormant on the books, used only on rare occasions to maintain the *status quo* in problems totally different from those of Reed and Prince and the Kentucky clay company.

The Labor Board, aware of the stormy history of the injunction in America's labor relations, is hesitant about even trying to use this provision of the law. While the NLRB must seek injunctions against unions, it can act at its discretion against management. Furthermore, there is a real fear that federal judges would refuse to issue injunctions against employers, since practices like refusals to bargain and a few firings have never been considered flagrant impositions on an orderly society.

Furthermore, even before they would ask for an injunction, NLRB officials would look for a clear violation of the law. Under the new "evidence" rules that becomes difficult to appraise. They also desire cases where

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wide public interest is involved, and that automatically eliminates the little factories like Reed and Prince and the clay works. The small unions will just have to remain easy prey for the employer, who, like the company of Reed and Prince, "prefers not to have a union in his plant."

Meanwhile, the national policy of promoting free collective bargaining, subscribed to in the Wagner Act and specifically approved even in the Taft-Hartley law, is being frustrated. In its zeal to curb the power of labor's giants, the 80th Congress wielded a bludgeon on the little unions that need help most. There is small chance now that there will ever be a union in the Kentucky clay factory. If a new one should come to life, the employer always has his lesson of the five-year fight in the courts that he couldn't lose. The same hand can be played again.

A few weeks ago, Senator Humphrey's Subcommittee, following its study of the Reed and Prince fiasco, released a report containing "19 ways to speed up procedures of the NLRB." Some of them were minor and unimportant. Others, like the suggestion of creating a special Court of Appeals to handle labor cases, will require action by the new Congress.

It is clear now that labor's present chances of repealing the Taft-Hartley Act are almost non-existent. The statute, so often flayed in broad terms, needs more careful, pin-point analysis. The new 83rd Congress might start with the Humphrey suggestions. For when the law's ambiguities and contradictions and loaded sections are clearly demonstrated, labor can hope that reasonable men will amend the statute. One minor change has already been made. But before others come, labor's weaker members can still be broken by clever lawyers and the slow years before the bar.

STUBBORN FACTS AND STUBBORN IDEALS

by Woodrow Wyatt

AT MORECAMBE in September the British Labour Party will hold its annual delegate conference. There the conflict will be fought once more between the restraints of responsibility and the dynamics of opposition; the pressures for wage increases, and the necessity for national solvency; the realities of threatened aggression, and the temptation to ignore unwelcome facts.

The Labour Party is an idealistic party. It hopes for a really better world. At home it has been astonishingly successful in realizing its ideals against formidable opposition. Its members do not think that they have created a Socialist Britain, but they can see and feel that the postwar Labour Governments made remarkable progress toward that end. Doctrine plays its part in Labour policy, but the driving force is idealism.

A party which is idealistic at home is idealistic abroad. It is not content to improve its own country: it wants to make the rest of the world happy. Most members of the Labour Party in 1945 were convinced that Britain could have averted the last war by a better foreign policy. They believed that we should have led the world in abandoning imperialism and power-politics and that we should have extended the hand of friendship to Russia.

Although the internal regime of Russia had shocked British democratic Socialists, they thought that the regime was made harsher by suspicions of Western intentions. These had forced the Russians to impose a ruthless discipline in case they were attacked from the West. They thought also that Russia, properly handled by Britain, would have been willing to join in effective collective security against Germany in support of Czechoslovakia and that Munich could have been avoided.

When Ernest Bevin said at the great Blackpool Conference before the General Election of 1945, "Left speaks to Left," he had all these things in mind. The rank and file and, to a large extent, the leadership felt that a Labour Government would speak enough of the same language as Russia to allay her fears and could give a lead in international morality that would pave the way to peace and harmony between the nations.

At home, in the first few years after the war when things did not go altogether according to the Labour Party plan, the reasons could be understood by the rank and file. The facts were on the doorstep and easily verifiable. The problems were in terms of their own immediate understanding. But overseas the facts were not agreed. The leaders of the Labour Party were brought hard up against Russian intractibility. The pattern of Russian intentions soon became clear to them because it made a direct impact at international conferences, and the information provided by government sources left no doubt as to what the Russians wanted. But the rank and file naturally did not see things the same way. Their idealism was still undimmed, and success in the home field only made for increased discontent at what seemed to be failure in the foreign.

The failure to make friends with Russia was put down

Woodrow Wyatt is Labour M.P. from Aston, Birmingham. He was Under-Secretary of State for War in the Labour government.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to a failure in Socialist application among the leaders. Ernest Bevin, it was thought, had swallowed the traditional Tory outlook of the Foreign Office officials. Otherwise, it was asked, how was it that a Labour Government could work in such close agreement with capitalist America against Russia? The facts of the international situation were too remote and too arguable to convince the rank and file. Even such an event as the Communist coup in Czechoslovakia could be explained by Communists and fellow-travelers as a spontaneous uprising of the Czechoslovakian people. The grim story of Eastern Europe was little known and often discounted as anti-Communist propaganda. In any case British radicals and Left-minded people have always tended to put the blame for what goes wrong abroad on their own government. It is a hangover from the days of Palmerston. It is hard for British liberals even now not to believe that if only the government at Westminster would do what is right all the troubles of the world could be smoothed over.

The very success of the Labour Government's abandonment of imperialism sharpened this uneasiness. The giving of independence to India, Pakistan, Burma and Ceylon was strikingly successful. Where Britain had been hated she suddenly became liked and respected, and the comparative tranquillity with which these changes were effected in Southeast Asia was another justification of the policy. The government's actions in this area were considered to be Socialist. If only, the lament ran, the government had had a "Socialist" foreign policy elsewhere the same happy results would have been achieved. The fact that in Southeast Asia, Britain had been able to act according to her own views, untrammelled by interference from foreign powers or without even having to consider their wishes or attitudes, was ignored. A "Socialist" foreign policy was possible in Southeast Asia because Britain was able to act on her own.

All during the lifetime of the postwar Labour Government there was a distinct cleavage on foreign policy between the leadership and a large section of the rank and file. Even Marshall Aid was suspect when it first began because it was felt that through it Britain was becoming dependent on capitalist America and that this would prevent the effective carrying out of a "socialist" foreign policy.

Bevin had the greatest difficulty in obtaining support at Labour Party Conferences for the need to realize the true nature of the expansionist designs of Communist Russia. It was with reluctance that the rank and file supported rearmament. They felt that resorting to rearmament was an admission that power-politics was still the operative factor in international relations and that this was an indication of the failure of Labour's foreign policy. But it was their government that was doing these things. Although many could not agree, they suppressed their feelings out of loyalty to the government. They gave half-hearted approval instead of outright opposition. When they were appealed to not to rock the government, they in general answered the appeal.

But all during this time from 1945 to 1951 an educative process was going on. A lot of the facts were sinking in. More and more the Labour Party had come to believe that the government had been right. By the end of the second Labour Government there was far more support in the Labour Party for the government's foreign policy than there had been in 1946 and 1947. Why then does it seem that opposition to that foreign policy, more or less agreed by both the parties, has increased and become much more formidable since the General Election?

Once the Labour Party left office all inhibitions on criticism vanished. Those who had been silent, or restrained in their complaints, felt free to give them full rein. All the suppressed discontents at the inability of Britain to impose a "Socialist" foreign policy on the world came out. Policies which had been accepted for fear of overthrowing the government became targets of attack once the government had been defeated. Now there is far greater activity in launching attacks on the official leadership's foreign policy by a smaller section than would have wished to launch these same attacks in 1946 or 1947. Even though there is less real opposition to the course pursued by the Labour Government, the noise made by that opposition is inevitably much greater. In addition, now that the Labour Party does not have responsibility and increasingly knows less of the real facts of the situation since it is denied the sources of information open to a government, the temptation toward irresponsibility mounts.

It is much easier to denounce rearmament when it is being carried through by a Tory Government than when it is initiated by a Labour Government. In the mood of postwar Britain only a Labour Government could have started a large rearmament program. If it had been demanded by a Conservative Government, there would have been violent opposition among the workers, and the British rearmament programme vital to the defense and morale of Europe would have been stillborn. Similarly German rearmament is a problem bound to arouse violent feelings in a Socialist Party. They were partly suppressed when the Labour Government conceded the principle of German rearmament and helped to prepare the ground for it. Now many in the Labour Party feel free to oppose German rearmament under any circumstances. They have much support among the rank and file.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But perhaps the most serious aspect of the absence of responsibility is the attitude toward America. Little is known here about the great labor unions or the feelings of the American working class. Most Labour Party members would be surprised to hear of the backing given by American trade unions to Marshall Aid. America is still regarded as a country of capitalists. Despite the fact that the Truman Administration has so manifestly pursued a wise, and unusually unselfish, course in international relations, Labour Party members find it hard to believe that America is not dominated by Wall Street tycoons who for reasons best known to themselves are pushing America and Britain into a war against Russia. It is grudingly accepted that the free world cannot carry through the vast schemes of development needed to raise living standards in the backward areas unless America takes a major share in these enterprises. It is not yet fully believed that in matters of security the safety of the free world rests on an interdependence between Britain and America.

There is probably more anti-Americanism in Britain today than there has ever been before. Pride, more than doubts as to the wisdom of American policy, is the cause of it. Britain has had a rough time fighting two wars for freedom longer and harder than any other country. At the end of them her material power has been diminished. Virtually the dominant force in the world in 1913, she now finds herself in third place—a good way behind America and Russia. The leadership of the free world has gone to America. Her economic strength and military power place her where Britain once was. The British would have to be angels not to resent their displacement by the Americans. They are bound to regard their own decline as no fault of theirs and to think of the Americans as men of business who have succeeded beyond their merits and who cannot have the same political maturity and understanding of the world scene as the British.

When America acts in a way that is thought unwise here, then the latent resentments come nearer to the surface. Particularly in the Labour Party it is always easier to secure enthusiasm for an anti-American approach than it is for the constructive proposition that it is vital to both Britain and America to work closely together. A government responsible for the nation can always see that more clearly than an opposition party. In opposition, the Labour Party is bound to be susceptible to suggestions that the American economic policy prevents British recovery and that her methods of fighting the Cold War, particularly in the East, are liable to lead us all to destruction.

But all these things do not mean that the Labour Party is throwing over the foreign policy that it built up when it was a government. What is being seen now is the emergence of the under-surface tensions and frustrations. An opposition is not obliged to be as careful as a government in formulating its views on foreign policy. Many pronouncements of Republican leaders on what to do about Chiang Kai-shek and Europe have caused alarm in Britain, although it is not certain that a Republican administration would necessarily follow the courses advocated by some of its leaders out of office. In the same way it must be accepted that the Labour Party will sometimes seem to be at variance with its own past actions.

In preparation for Morecambe numerous resolutions against rearmament, against the Anglo-American alliance, against West German rearmament have been sent in by the local constituency party organizations. Few have been submitted in support of the official leadership's approach to foreign policy. But there is nothing unusual in this: it happens year after year. The resolutions originate with the most vociferous and least rooted. Or they come from middle-class Labour parties in strong conservative centers like Cheltenham, Leamington or Bournemouth.

They become almost an expression of guilt by their composers anxious to prove their Socialism. When the conference opens, these resolutions will be wrapped up into composite resolutions. Almost certainly they will be defeated, as usual, by resolutions moved or accepted by the platform. The great trade unions will in the main back the official leadership. The effect of the Bevanites will be neutralized by the fact that Mr. Bevan and three of his lieutenants are on the National Executive and will have to subscribe to the official attitude for which they cannot escape responsibility. They cannot speak against official resolutions and can hardly encourage others to do so. It will be surprising if there are any violent clashes on these issues. The conference will probably prove to be an anti-climax. In the framing of the official resolutions some concessions will be made to rank-and-file feeling among the constituency parties, without altering fundamental concepts. That will be the most that the Labour Party will move toward Mr. Bevan's point of view and it might well have gone as far even if Mr. Bevan had never existed.

On foreign policy the Labour Party in opposition has traditionally moved to what is often, though inaccurately, described as the Left. But foreign policies are enjoined on governments by the facts and circumstances they are faced with. There is no reason to suppose that the next Labour Government will differ very much in its approach from the two postwar Labour Governments. The national interest will dictate the course of action as before.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LITERATURE AND THE ARTS

A FORGOTTEN HERESY

by Herbert Read

CERTAIN OF the paintings of Hieronymous van Aken, the Flemish painter who died at Hertogenbosch in 1516, have always puzzled the world by their enigmatic symbolism. The general assumption has been that Bosch was indulging in a wild and incoherent fantasy on which only psychoanalysis might eventually throw some light. An element of Rabelaisian satire was also suspected, but in general critics until now have been content to regard Bosch as *"un faizeur des diables,"* serving up a hellish brew for our shuddering delight.

THE MILLENIUM OF HIERONYMUS BOSCH, by Wilhelm Fraenger. Translated Eithne Wilkins and Ernest Kaiser (University of Chicago $10).

Dr. Fraenger's brilliant book clears up the mystery in a most decisive way. He makes a detailed study of one painting —the famous triptych now in the Prado Museum in Madrid which used to be known as *The Garden of Earthly Delights*, but which the author now entitles *The Millenium*. Obviously this painting follows the tradition of the late Gothic altar-piece, but equally obviously its contents are so antagonistic to any orthodox religious requirements that it cannot possibly have been executed for a Christian church. But starting from the hypothesis that the picture was nevertheless devotional, Dr. Fraenger came to the conclusion that it must have been intended as a new type of devotional picture for heretics, and that the images represented in the painting are a secret revelation of the mysteries of a cult.

The subjects depicted—the Garden of Eden, with the Creator bringing Adam and Eve together, Paradise with throngs of the children of Adam and Eve—suggested an Adamite sect, such as existed in the early days of the Church and such as was revived during the Renaissance. Dr. Fraenger has discovered records of such a sect in the Netherlands in the fifteenth century, the Homines Intelligentiae or Brothers and Sisters of the Free Spirit, and from records of their trials for heresy he has been able to reconstruct their beliefs in sufficient detail to show that Bosch's painting is indeed a pictorial record of their dogmas and sacraments.

The Adamite sects have usually been condemned as secret conventicles of licentious nudists, but there is no doubt that they were inspired by high and even ascetic ideals. On the basis of the contemporary authorities, Dr. Fraenger conjectures that:

> The Adamites in their subterranean assemblies around a fire, the mystic centre of all evolving life, were trying — by virtue of their ritual nakedness — to achieve a re-birth into a state of paradisiacal innocence. In view of their pronounced aversion from marriage, their worship in nakedness must be considered as ascetic neutralization of sexuality, in which they evidently saw Original Sin, and furthermore an unveiled, candid showing of themselves to God, before whose eyes they believed they dwelt in Paradise.

It was a form of Platonic love that they celebrated, and a Neo-Platonist like Pico della Mirandola had a good deal to do with the elaboration of the heresy. They made a distinction (largely lost today) between eros and sex, and:

> the danger that such a notion of impersonal love might be vulgarized, and sexuality reduced to an animal instinct, was precluded by the sect's second principle, the axiom that man was made in the image of God and thereby raised to the highest conceivable spiritual level, while the desired re-union of the sexes could only be achieved through the sanctification of love.

The Millenium is a very complex composition, embracing literally hundreds of significant symbols. Dr. Fraenger's task is to elucidate these symbols in detail, and this he does with the aid of his great erudition. It is a fascinating voyage of exploration, and in the end it induces in the reader a good deal of sympathy for this exterminated cult. Dr. Fraenger supposes (on very good evidence) that the tritypch was not Bosch's own conception — it was dictated by a Grand Master of the cult whose portrait can be identified in the right-hand corner of the central panel. From this mentor Bosch "learned a language so deep and so universal that it could embrace the reality of Nature and God's, the ideal image of a "creative harmony."

> This ecstatic Nature-cult, with its Dionysiac raptures, is fundamentally and completely different from the ascetic morality of the over-spiritualized and anti-sensual Church; yet in all its overbrimming joyousness it keeps to a solid core of spiritual calm, which makes the sensuality of this tritypch utterly different in principle from the grotesque, anarchic excesses that we think of as Rabelaisian. Here a classical delight in the body and a belief in salvation through spiritual baptism have been miraculously welded.

And we conclude, as Dr. Fraenger concludes, by wondering what the spiritual fate of the West might have been if a root-and-branch Reformation had been carried out by the Disciples of the Free Spirit and not by Pauline theology, Calvinistic theocracy and Tridentine reaction.

Bosch has always been a popular artist, as well as an intellectually intriguing one; thanks to Dr. Fraenger his deeper significance can at last be fully appreciated.

The book is fully illustrated in color and half-tone, and exceptionally well translated.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

IN ASIA AND ELSEWHERE

LANDS BEYOND, by Willy Ley and L. Sprague de Camp (Rinehart; $4.75).
TIBETAN SKY LINES, by R. B. Ekvall (Farrar, Straus & Young; $3.50).
SOMEWHERE IN NEW GUINEA, by Frank Clune (Philosophical Library; $4.50).
SCHOALS OF CAPRICORN, by F. D. Ommonney (Harcourt, Brace; $4).

IN THESE DAYS of flying saucers and flamboyant imagination, a book by one of the world's foremost experts on rockets and interplanetary travel entitled *Lands Beyond* immediately induces an expectancy for other worlds, even other solar systems; but not in this case. In a sense, though, this compilation of early explorations from the time of Ulysses to the last great era of discovery following the Treaty of Tordesillas, wherein the Borgian Pope divided the New World between Spain and Portugal, deals with the extraterrestrial since little truth reposed in the reports and transports of the men who performed the globe-trotting of antiquity.

Willy Ley and L. Sprague de Camp jointly put together these tales from Homer, Herodotus, the Arabian Nights and other sources and what is more, they have suggested explanations for the more fantastic episodes; somewhat like Mark Twain's sea captain in *Idle Notes of an Idle Excursion* who had managed to reduce all the miracles in the Old Testament to matters of reasonable logic. Even the travels of Sinbad, roc and all, have been explained in *Lands Beyond*. It is a little surprising that, in spite of all the latitude allowed the editors, that the book should prove disappointing and somehow sterile.

Other lands beyond are described in Robert B. Ekvall in *Tiebtan Sky Lines*. Mr. Ekvall is a missionary who lived in northeastern Tibet; he describes Tibetans, and does not confine his book to the now-trite surveys of the topography and devil-blandishments of semi-fictitious lamaseries or the superhuman virtuousness of inhabitants. Instead, Mr. Ekvall tells of his Tibetan friends. "Stretchears" Jamtsen and "Slabface" Rinchen, their hunts, their quarrels and their lives and he does it simply and very well.

It is a pleasure to read Mr. Ekvall's account of his war with the local lamasery over his right to buy—and move—a haunted house, his skirmishes with bandits and the details of his negotiations with Chinese warlords in behalf of his Tibetan neighbors, as well as the mildly humorous recounting of the somewhat devious Tibetan morality. Altogether, *Tibetan Sky Lines* manages to present an authentic and highly intriguing account of Tibet without visible effort. One could wish that Mr. Ekvall's photography were better, but it's a minor point and it does not detract from the book.

Still dealing with the more remote areas in a rapidly contracting globe, the Australian equivalent of the late Ernie Pyle, Frank Clune, has finally published a book which was originally written in 1940 *Somewhere in New Guinea* has now been up-dated and released in the United States for those interested in travel written in the richest Australian and without a glossary. An American unfamiliar with billabongs, bonzer and other Australian esoterica may find it rough going in spots but if he managed to stick it out he will learn a lot about the gold-seeking pioneers of Papua and their troubles with the head-hunting and cannabalistic Kukukukus.

Mr. Clune, in those feverish days of enclaves and police actions in what was then Netherlands India, had just published a book on India and was preparing another on the tribulations of the Indonesian archipelago. A genial and friendly soul, he had the valuable asset of observing life an octave higher in pitch than most of us saw it and the ability to translate his perceptions to the written word. Mr. Clune's world is a world of heroes and good fellows and it is pleasant, and most instructive, to join him in looking at it. He is a prolific writer, completing approximately one book annually, and if his writing is not polished, there is a certain stilted vividness which gets his ideas across even if a faint whiff of perspiration accompanies the victory. The book contains a number of wash illustrations, apparently made from photographs.

North of Madagascar and east of Tanganyika, the Seychelles Islands contain one of the world's most anomalous societies. Constructed of French creole families, Britishers engaged in business, Indians and Chinese, also engaged in more intense business and African creole families who are engaged in all kinds of business, albeit briefly and sporadically, and including the variety known as "monkey," social life in the Seychelles seldom lacks commentable activity, although it exists within all too narrow ranges. Large, slightly illegitimate families covering wide chromatic ranges, appear typical of the Seychelles petite bourgeoisie, and reckless fecundity the principle vitrue.

F. D. Ommanney's *Shoals of Capricorn* is a thoroughly delightful yarn of his recent survey of the piscatorial waters surrounding the reefs and shoals of the Seychelles and makes as good reading as anything published in the travel category for some years. Sympathetic but sharp-eyed, the author uses a well-developed sense of humor with discernment and discretion.

LAWRENCE GRISWOLD

CHAUCER MADE NEW

THE CANTERBURY TALES, by Geoffrey Chaucer, translated into modern English by Nevill Coghill (Penguin; $1.25).

ONE CAN ARGUE the validity or usefulness of modernizations of Chaucer pretty persuasively in either direction. The most common case against them is a total case: namely, that the art of Chaucer precisely *is* his language and that to lose his special forms, his usages, is to lose his peculiar manner of perceiving, and thus in short to lose Chaucer. Yet it remains true that even an incomplete mastery (which after all can presumably give only an incomplete enjoyment) of Chaucer's language requires an effort of study that few, in our restless and unscholarly modern society, are capable of making. And though it would clearly be best if a broader segment of the reading public could find time for the effort, it is at least better, in the present state of things, to make a great work like *The Canterbury Tales* available to as many

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

people as possible, even at the cost of a minimal dilution.

Certainly, in any case, Chaucer's art has no business being the special province of scholars. Composed in the racy English of everyday fourteenth century speech, and designed not so much to be read as to be read aloud to sizable audiences, these poems have more in common with the dramatic verse of the Elizabethans than they have with any other non-dramatic English verse. No other poetry in English so urgently demands to be heard. And it could well be argued that modernization is the only way to fulfill the demand. For even among those who understand Chaucerian English, a miniscule number are able to master it aloud. The difficulty of Chaucer's language is greater than many students of it would be willing to admit. And, too, when the merely occasional reader of Chaucer's original derives a certain titillation from the "quaintness" of expression, is that response any less alien to the real spirit of Chaucer than what is provided by a good modern version?

The answer of course hinges on the degree of dilution: what counts is the Chaucerness of the version. In this Mr. Coghill has achieved what seems to me a fantastic degree of success. Most previous translators have slipped into one of both of two snares. One is the *apparent* proximity of Chaucer's language and structure to our own: it is possible simply to modernize spellings and substitute occasional words. But the result is queer word orders, rhymes we no longer make, and rhythms that seem wrenched to the modern ear. This is the usual form of the trots used by hard-pressed college students. The other is (perhaps was) the temptation to write Victorian Gothic. Both are bastard products, as stale and unrefreshed as they are un-Chaucerian. Mr. Coghill, on the other hand, has probably taken more verbal liberties than any previous translator with the result that his version has the same part freshness and racy modernity that the original must have had for Chaucer's contemporaries. And since it remains so remarkably faithful to Chaucer's real spirit and manner, it is likely to give intense satisfaction to all but the most extreme purists.

Chaucer is an especially useful poet to read today: his sanity, his robust joy, his expansive simplicity can teach us much in an age of neuroticism, febrile despair, and crabbed complexity. His civilized and courteous belches can prove a powerful relief to our tortured forms of literary indigestion. And the open directness of his manner toward his audience makes its own commentary on the embittered alienation of our writers. If, as Edmund Wilson suggested some years ago, verse is a dying technique, it may be precisely because we have lost those very faculties that make both Chaucer and Shakespeare (who inherited more from the Chaucerian tradition than one usually imagines) the peak points of the great tradition of English verse.

It is impossible to separate Chaucer from the unified society behind him; and in this connection it is interesting to note the origin of Mr. Coghill's versions. They were prepared beginning in 1946 for a series of readings on the BBC's Third Programme, and several have since been recorded by outstanding actors on the English stage: a good example of what is presently within the British capacity for what would in this country be called popular culture. It is the kind of thing that suggests how much more closely the unity of Chaucer's culture is approximated by the society of modern Britain than it is by that of the USA. WILLIAM BECKER

THE GOOD CRITIC

MUSICAL TRENDS IN THE 20TH CENTURY, by Norman Demuth (Macmillan: $7).

IN AN AGE when musicians, because of conflicting aims, aesthetic standards, and artistic philosophies, have found themselves perched on what appears to be a Tower of Babel, they have been abandoned by the body of thinking men who could, conceivably, provide a basis for some kind of mutual understanding. In dealing with the 20th century, music critics have generally shown a preference for the practical equivalent of Charles Lamb. Those few who have allowed themselves the luxury of judging the work of their own time have usually allowed themselves to identify with one conflicting fashion or another, and thus absolve themselves from personal responsibility. Only a few people writing in English have managed to combine courage with that detachment which is necessary for making valid evaluations of new work. In this country, the late Paul Rosenfeld represented this kind of criticism, and his death has left us with only a few men—Alfred Frankenstein of the San Francisco *Chronicle* is such a critic—who are equipped to judge new work and whose judgment is conditioned by actual knowledge.

This generally bad state of affairs makes Norman Demuth's new book more gratifying to musicians than it really deserves to be. This is because Demuth, in his writing, represents that standard of criticism which should guide all music critics in their work. As a scholar, Demuth demonstrates a fidelity to truth which is never sacrificed to those personal idiosyncrasies on matters of taste in which the critic likes to indulge. This intellectual integrity has made it possible for Demuth to document, with the greatest accuracy and a really surprising attention to detail, those very contemporary movements with which he is least in sympathy. His extraordinary knowledge of the work of the past 50 years gives his personal thinking vastly more authority than it could command if his opinions were not so obviously thoroughly considered.

Because of his identification with the French and English moderns, Demuth is relatively—and I should say, self-consciously—weak in his analysis of the German moderns and many of their alien counterparts. He is unusually perceptive in his discussion of the American groups, and has done a great service to the neglected composers of twenty-five years ago. As a student of trends, he is completely divorced from fashion. Unlike most American critics, he seems to assume that music has some permanent values which are not conditioned by the current *chic*. His book, and others like it, are badly needed now.

ROBERT EVETT

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

AN HONEST EVALUATION

THE CIO AND THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY, by Fay Calkins (University of Chicago; $4).

FEW STUDIES have been made available for public consumption which frankly depict the structure of the CIO Political Action Committee and the nature of its political relationship with the political parties. This does.

It is fundamentally honest and factual, admirably so in light of the fact that Miss Calkins has been personally and ideologically associated with the CIO. She was formerly an education director for a CIO international union and more recently was research assistant for National PAC. The study was made while she was a staff member of the Industrial Relations Center at the University of Chicago, the first in a series of studies planned by the Center on the economic and political impact of unionism on modern American institutions.

Miss Calkins presents five alternative kinds of relationships which are possible between the PAC and a political party. There are, of course, others but these types are the most significant and normally prevail. All of her case studies are based on the 1950 local, state and Congressional elections.

The widely publicized Ohio contest between Sen. Robert A. Taft and State Auditor Joseph Ferguson is presented as the PAC supplementing a campaign. Actually, as Miss Calkins clearly illustrates, PAC and the other labor groups really shouldered the campaign. Other alternative relationships include Steubenville, Ohio, where PAC became a balance of power; Chicago where PAC fought the Democratic machine; Rockford, Ill., where PAC entered the county Democratic Party and Michigan where PAC entered the state Democratic Party.

As far as this reviewer can ascertain from the several cases with which he is personally familiar the presentations are fair and the evaluations are honest. The author freely praises and freely criticizes PAC. It is definitely not a CIO tome. Rather, it leaves one with the impression, that PAC has delved into the high art of political strategy, the second step, with a vengeance by a few while it has given the vital function of political education, the first step, only a wishful lick and a promise.

The rooted mistakes in Ohio and other places are not clearly revealed. Perhaps that was not the function of this book. It is hoped that this subject will find itself high on the list of priorities for future studies at the University of Chicago Center.

H. F. C.

RADIO LECTURES

THE PROBLEM OF POWER: *The Reith Lectures*, by Lord Radcliffe (Macmillan; $1.75).

LORD RADCLIFFE, an eminent London K.C., dislikes the dictum attributed to Lord Acton, "All power tends to corrupt," etc., and in this small book he takes it apart, skillfully and ruthlessly. History, logic and common experience join in furnishing what he regards as conclusive evidence that some men are better, not worse, for exercising authority.

The Reith Lectures are presented annually by the British Broadcasting Company, which means that the lecturer must eschew professional jargon; but the BBC, although a radio system, has no objection to close reasoning expressed in plain language. The seven Radcliffe lectures will send no high school student to the dictionary, but they may strain his power to concentrate, for they are not light reading.

The conspicuous fault of the book is his lordship's apparent ignorance of American experience with political power. One might easily infer that he has read no commentator later than Macaulay; for the significance of Jefferson's emendation of Locke's three rights escapes him, and he does not even mention Jefferson's enormously important dictum that majority rule "to the rightful must be reasonable." The result is that his analysis of American political power goes far astray. To misconstrue the nature of American power in the modern world is hardly a negligible error, in view of the relative importance of that power. It reduces materially the value of Lord Radcliffe's book.

GERALD W. JOHNSON

THE SILVER CHORD

IN DEFENSE OF MOTHERS, by Leo Kanner (Thomas; $3).

THE AUTHOR seems to prove the old adage wrong, namely that psychiatrists are "dry" and lack any sense of humor. Already the subtitle, "or how to bring up children in spite of the more zealous psychologists," may be a case in point, in addition to a cover and seventeen rather amusing illustrations, one for each chapter, by Kurt Wiese.

Every lay person these days speaks of the Freudian "Unconscious" as he does of the atomic bomb, without of course being a psychiatrist or a physicist respectively. The "good" mother, therefore, far back in the jungle of her mind, where the God Unconscious leads a hidden existence, will ask herself (or her Unconscious), 'just how did He ever get there? Did He grow up with the little chromosomes and go through all the embroyonic stages and changes? Did He slip in some time during the nine months of pregnancy? Did He enter at the moment of birth?' (this is, pointedly, being illustrated by a little boy standing questioning before an Egyptian Sphinx).

Speaking of chromosomes, the author gives (so it seems to this reviewer who had to "digest" scores of books on sex and sex education) one of the most clever arguments for the right type of answering questions, neither evading the child's questions nor going overboard—delivering lectures on sex to a half-baked mind. Dr. Kanner writes:

"Children ask: What makes the automobile run? Why does the snow melt? Where does the soap bubble go when it bursts? Why won't you let me drink coffee. . . . A child asks questions and gets answers. That's all."

Just who should be "suitable" companions for your children? Of course, they must deserve the distinction of being faultless unless you play the old game, "My Child Is Too Good For Your Child."

HANS A. ILLING

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE PRIME MINISTER

WINSTON CHURCHILL, by Robert Lewis Taylor (Doubleday; $4.50).

ROBERT LEWIS TAYLOR'S anecdotal book on Winston Churchill—"an informal study of greatness"—is not so much a study as it is a verbalized infatuation. For he seems quite certain that those who are in any way doubtful of the Prime Minister's status as Anglo-Saxon demigod are a scurvy lot; misguided, immature, envious, unprincipled or (horrors!) socialist.

As an informal biographer Taylor is, as always, witty, facile and entertaining. However when he begins pontificating on assorted political and military matters, he falls flat on his *bon mots.*

Taylor has a peculiar phobia about Churchill and war. He keeps bringing up the fact that Churchill has been happiest with some war or other in progress; and just as often denies that Winnie is a war-monger. Then he wrathfully points out that this charge is "the favorite line of Hyde Park speakers, Russian Communists, and American 'intellectuals' "—all, of course, equally disreputable.

However, if Taylor's political polemics are not very impressive, his anecdotes most certainly are. And that, after all, is why people read Robert Lewis Taylor's books in the first place.

STANLEY COOPERMAN

A THEATRE MISCELLANY

THE PLAYS OF GEORG BUECHNER, translated with an introduction by Geoffrey Dunlop. (Ravin; $3).

What playwright has had three great works to show before reaching the age of twenty four? The only one known to me is Georg Buechner. And if sheer merit isn't enough to recommend a man in this historically-minded age, I can add that the finest playwright now working, Bertold Brecht, has gone to school to him. (For an instance, not of plagiary but of the absorption of one writer's style by another, compare the first page of *Woyzeck* with the first page of *Mother Courage.*)

Mr. Dunlop's volume, though his publisher is not inclined to confess it, was first issued some 25 years ago. It must have been welcome in 1927 as a gallant piece of pioneering. Even then it had its limitations. It was not based on the best German source, Fritz Bergemann's edition (1922). The translations were neither faithful copies of the original nor acceptable as English drama in their own right. Lacking the exactitude of literal translation, Mr. Dunlop's versions lacked also the distinction which alone could justify such wide departures from the German.

I do not have a copy of the 1927 edition on hand, but I doubt if there is anything new in the present volume besides a single title—A. H. J. Knight's *Georg Buechner*—in the bibliography. Mr. Dunlop's introduction notes remain useful to the reader who has no German, yet it is offhand of him, to say the least, to add Knights book to the bibliography while completely ignoring in bibliography and introduction alike, Professor Vietor's much more important volumes.

Perhaps it is better to have a great author accessible in any form than in none. Even so, *Leonce and Lena* is the only play Messrs. Dunlop and Ravin are putting back in circulation. *Danton's Death* and *Woyzeck* are both available, better translated—the former in *From the Modern Repertoire I*, the latter in *New Directions 12*. The rest of Buechner—*Lenz*, *Ler Lessische Landbote*, the letters—still awaits its first English translator.

E.B.

THE ART OF TELEVISION, by Jan Bussell (Faber and Faber; 18/—).

If, as we hear, British television is superior to ours, the advantages may lie simply in an equanimity and lack of pretension woefully missing in our own networks. The "art" Bussell describes is neither that of the progenitors of a cultural millennium nor that of the practitioners of a racket. He cheerfully sets out to explain what goes into television shows and conveys enough of the studio set-up, the handling of lights, camera and sound, performing styles and production techniques to gratify the inquisitive viewer and to give the would-be employee a notion of what lies ahead. His examples are helpfully mundane. The samples he appends of his own drama is pleasingly trite and competent. Perhaps he demands a little too much "faith" from an audience and sketches a kind of self-induced intensity for actors that only masquerades as "sincerity," but on the whole it is decidedly refreshing to find so much useful information so economically and unassumingly presented by a craftsman of middlebrow entertainment.

THEODORE HOFFMAN

EDWARDIAN THEATRE, by A. E. Wilson (Macmillan; $4.50).

This is one of those useful bad books. It becomes useful simply by being unique: Much of the material it contains is not readily available anywhere else. But it is bad in its pettish nostalgia, its uncritical spirit, its eulogistic tone. There is no doubt that the period makes marvellous material; it was the cradle of theatrical modernity, a maelstrom of conflicting styles—from the extravagant rhetoric of Beerbohm Tree, through the new realism of Forbes-Robertson and Granville-Barker, to the grandiose austerity of Gordon Craig. But Mr. Wilson seems more concerned to urge its marvels than to demonstrate them in any but the most superficial way. Without the wisdom that historical hindsight might have given him, he offers us nothing by way of analysis, and depends for his descriptions largely on the breathless adjectival jargon of contemporary journalists. It is the book not of a careful historian and critic, fixing the period for posterity and from posterity's point of view (like, say, Laurence Irving's recent study of his grandfather), but of a starry-eyed playgoer re-living somewhat belligerently the whole period, and re-living it on its own terms, not on ours. For Mr. Wilson seems himself a displaced Edwardian: he is smug, snobbish, reactionary (even to the point of preferring Victorian hangovers like Tree and Pinero to more modern Edwardian products like Granville-Barker and Shaw). He is rather bored by ideas, feels socially critical plays to be the expression of warped and dreary minds,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and is more attracted by the general glitter of stage personalities (which, one must admit, the Edwardians had in abundance) than he is by the serious problems of stage art (which they had in equal abundance). Actually Mr. Wilson succeeds best in convincing us how much we should like to have something good on the same subject.

WILLIAM BECKER

SHAKESPEARE'S MOTLEY, by Leslie Hotson (Oxford, $3.50).

Leslie Hotson, one of the most assiduous of the scholar-detectives, is off on a minor adventure this time, but he has come up with some evidence on Shakespeare's fools that should titivate the academies and give pause to the theatre. He effectively destroys the common association of the fool's "motley" with the parti-colored jerkin and tights of the medieval jester. Motley was a coarse cloth woven, like tweed, with various colored threads. It was of a greenish or yellowish hue and probably had two false sleeves; a handkerchief and wooden dagger hung from the waist, a small horn may have carried out the hunter's green motif. Like the skirts of children, women, and priests, the costume was a sign of protection and privilege.

Hotson studies the two types of court fool: the "natural," like Lear's fool, who, if he had an estate, was made king's ward and was frequently farmed out to some noble who cared for him and had the use of his income; and the "artificial" or professional fool, like Feste, who provided a more organized kind of wit. Shakespeare's use on the stage of these two types of sagacious fool was almost unique, and Hotson makes it clear that, as acted by Robert Armin, they greatly differed from the rustic clown of Tarlton and the buffoons of Kempe and Cowley.

This much of the book is quite worthwhile, but Hotson's biographical sketch of Armin conveys little of that actor's reputed brilliance, and his conjecture that Shakespeare was Spenser's Aetion seems to be based on a personal acquaintance with the goodness of Shakespeare's soul. Hotson's one-track fervor may strike the scholars as not altogether trustworthy, but as a private eye he has handled the case well for his theatre clients. The next step is for someone to oblige us with a change of costume and get Shakespeare's fools out their harlequin Dr. Dentons and the fey posturings usually assigned them. It's time we had a Feste whose professional duties set him off from the real fools around him and enable him to provide the moral commentary so vital to *Twelfth Night*. And perhaps only a literally mad fool can make sense out there on *Lear's* storm swept heath.

THEODORE HOFFMAN

SHAKESPEARE, THE COMPLETE WORKS, edited G. B. Harrison (Harcourt, Brace; $10).

It is a curious fact that the two best-edited one-volume Shakespeares, Dr. O. J. Campbell's and Dr. G. B. Harrison's, have both up to now been incomplete. Happily, this re-issue of Dr. Harrison's edition has been filled out to include every word Shakespeare is known to have written.

By "best-edited" I mean "most serviceable to the general reader." Dr. Harrison's introduction, plates, and appendices amount to an admirable short book on Shakespeares life, theatre, and times, a summary of modern and older scholarship that includes all in the way of background information that general readers require. His footnotes strike the golden mean of informativeness: enough facts but not too many.

As critic, Dr. Harrison is limited. His appreciations of the various plays offer readers little more than they could offer themselves. The new book is open to attack on other grounds too. Its pages are by no means as handsome and readable as those of the Shakespeare Head edition (one among several reasons being that characters' names are abridged, "Oth." for "Othello" etc.). And it costs too much. One buys a one-volume Shakespeare chiefly because it is so much cheaper than individual volumes: How, otherwise, could one face the weight and bulk of such a book and the horror of its double columns? Ten dollars or about five too many.

E.B.

Polio Pledge 1952

FOR PARENTS

I WILL NOT

allow my children to mix with new groups.

let my children become fatigued or chilled.

take my children out of camp or playground where there is good health supervision.

I WILL

let my children play with their usual companions.

see that they keep clean.

be watchful for signs of polio—headache, fever, sore throat, upset stomach, tenderness and stiffness of neck and back.

call my local March of Dimes chapter if polio strikes for whatever assistance or financial help I may need.

Recommended by

THE NATIONAL FOUNDATION FOR INFANTILE PARALYSIS

PERSONAL

exit loneliness

Somewhere there is someone you would like to know. Somewhere there is someone who would like to know you. We can help you find a richer, happier life through discreet, dignified 'social introductions.' *Write for booklet, or phone*

MAY RICHARDSON

Dept. N.R., 111 West 72 Street

New York City EN 2-2033

Changing Your Address?

√ Make sure you receive your copies of the *New Republic* without interruption. Three weeks' notice is requested. To help us locate your stencil quickly, please send us your old address as well as the new.

The Post Office will not forward copies unless you provide extra postage.

New Republic

40 East 49 St., New York 17, N. Y.

PRINTED BY NATIONAL PUBLISHING CO., 301 N. ST., N. E., WASHINGTON 2, D. C.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

OVER 1,000 THINKING AMERICANS

have already subscribed to

the next 13 issues

of

New Republic

and the 12 page pamphlet

on

ADLAI STEVENSON – The man and his views . . .

The Charles C. Sherrod Library
EAST TENNESSEE STATE COLLEGE
Johnson City, Tennessee

all for only $1.00

The *New Republic's* reprint, "Stevenson—A Summary of His Views," has now been enlarged into a 12-page pamphlet with coated cover. There have been added Richard A. Meyer's brief and illuminating biography, "Adlai Stevenson—Growth of a Man," and the *New Republic's* widely acclaimed editorial, "Toward the Great Tomorrows."

To receive this first and most comprehensive campaign document FREE and the next 13 issues of the *New Republic*, simply attach a ONE DOLLAR BILL to the order form below, fill in your name and mail to the address given.

Or, if you are already a subscriber and would like copies of the STEVENSON pamphlet for distribution to friends or fellow-members of organizations, you may order at the low bulk prices given in the lower left-hand corner.

"If Stevenson and Eisenhower are true to themselves, the 1952 campaign can be as memorable and constructive as the debates of Roosevelt, Wilson and Taft in 1912." The *New Republic* will bring to its readers throughout this campaign fresh enlightenment and informed interpretation. To make sure that you receive every issue, SUBSCRIBE.

BULK REPRINT PRICES:

50 copies	$4
100 copies	$6
200 copies	$11
500 copies	$25
1000 copies	$45

(All prices cover postage)

Write for terms on larger quantities or specially printed editions.

CUT

NEW REPUBLIC • 40 E. 49 ST. • NEW YORK 17, N.Y.

☐ For the attached one dollar please send me 13 weeks of the New Republic and the Stevenson reprint free.

☐ For the enclosed $..... please send me ..... copies of the Stevenson reprint.

NAME .....

ADDRESS .....

CITY..... ZONE..... STATE.....

9-1-52

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED